

REMARKS

A. Objections of Form

1. Objection to Drawings

In the Office Action of January 24, 2006, the drawings were objected to because FIG. 1 was not labeled as prior art. The present amendment contains a proposed amendment that labels FIG. 1 as prior art. Accordingly, the objection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

2. Objection to Claims

Claim 1 was objected to because the phrase “wherein said first constant current source ~~that~~ limits a charging current of said intermediate circuit capacitor” is not grammatically correct. The phrase has been amended so as to delete the word “that.” Since the phrase is now grammatically correct, the objection has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Note that the amendment made to claim 1 is being made solely to correct an obvious typographical mistake and so is not related to patentability as defined in *Festo Corporation v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., Ltd.*, 234 F.3d 558, 56 USPQ2d 1865 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (*en banc*), *overruled in part*, 535 U.S. 722 (2002).

B. 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Roden et al. Applicants traverse this rejection for several reasons. First, claim 1 recites a first and a second constant current source. Roden does not disclose using a constant current source. It is noted that the Office Action fails to state where Roden discloses the constant current sources recited in claim 1. Applicants will take this failure as an admission that Roden does not disclose the recited constant current sources. Accordingly, the rejection is improper and should be

withdrawn.

The rejection of claim 1 is improper for the additional reason that Roden et al. fails to disclose “an electronic control device that controls both said first constant current source and said second constant current source in parallel.” The Office Action apparently regards controller 800 as reading on the recited electronic control device. If this is the case, the controller 800 does not control two constant current sources in parallel since Roden et al. does not disclose any constant current sources. Accordingly, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claim 3 is improper because Roden et al. does not disclose a common control signal for both constant current sources being generated from an output signal of a current sensor. As mentioned above, Roden et al. does not disclose any constant current sources and so it follows that Roden et al. does not disclose the recited common control signal.

The rejection of claim 4 is improper because Roden et al. does not disclose switching off both constant current sources if an output signal of a current sensor is too high. Roden et al. discloses that an output signal of controller circuitry 800 interrupts switches when the current exceeds a threshold value (Col. 8, ll. 16-18). Nowhere does Roden et al. disclose that circuitry turns off constant current sources.

The rejections of claims 5 and 6 are improper because Roden et al. does not disclose switching on both constant current sources if an output signal of a current sensor is too low. Nowhere does Roden et al. disclose that circuitry turns on constant current sources based on an output signal of a current sensor.

The rejection of claim 7 is improper because Roden et al. does not disclose using chokes for the recited feed lines. It is noted that the Office Action fails to state where Roden discloses

the recited chokes. Applicants will take this failure as an admission that Roden does not disclose the recited chokes. Accordingly, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Besides not being anticipated by Roden et al., claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Roden et al. In particular, there is no motivation to alter Roden et al. to either use two constant current sources or to use an electronic device that control two constant current sources in parallel. Without such motivation, claim 1 is patentable over Roden et al.

C. 35 U.S.C. § 103

1. Roden et al. and Assow

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious in view of Roden et al. and Assow. Claim 8 depends indirectly on claim 1. As pointed out above in Section B, Roden et al. does not disclose either using two constant current sources or an electronic device that control two constant current sources in parallel. Assow does not cure the deficiencies of Roden et al. since it does not suggest altering Roden et al. to use either two constant current sources or an electronic device that control two constant current sources in parallel. Without such suggestion, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

2. Roden et al. and Glennon

Claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious in view of Roden et al. and Glennon. Claim 9 and 10 each depends indirectly on claim 1. As pointed out above in Section B, Roden et al. does not disclose either using two constant current sources or an electronic device that control two constant current sources in parallel. Glennon does not cure the deficiencies of Roden et al. since it does not suggest altering Roden et al. to use either two constant current sources or an electronic device that control two constant current sources in

parallel. Without such suggestion, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the arguments above, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims 1-10 are in condition for allowance and seek an early allowance thereof. If for any reason, the Examiner is unable to allow the application in the next Office Action and believes that an interview would be helpful to resolve any remaining issues, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorneys at (312) 321-4200.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J.C. Freeman", written over a horizontal line.

John C. Freeman
Registration No. 34,483
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER
GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, Illinois 60610
(312) 321-4200

Dated: April 27, 2006

In the Drawings:

Applicants are submitting a proposed correction for original FIG. 1 wherein the label "PRIOR ART" has been added.

The changes have been indicated in red ink. Furthermore, it is not believed that the corrections involve new matter. Accordingly, please indicate whether the corrections are acceptable in the next Office Action.

